HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 17 — Saturday, April 23, 1955 — Washington, D. C.

News Section

Political Talk: Former President Truman's speech in Washington last weekend, it is estimated, contributed the biggest asset to the Eisenhower Administration's political chances since 1952. "Give 'em hell" oratory from the discredited former President revived reactions which brought the voters to the polls in that year to defeat "Truman and Trumanism." (This view of the meaning of the '52 election, however, is not that of many in the White House staff, who believe that the victory was the result of some personal magic of Eisenhower.)

● Some Republican staff analysts on the Hill were saying that if the Democrats were to nominate a conservative — for instance, Byrd or Lausche — they could easily defeat Eisenhower in 1956. But conservative Democrats, here for the meeting, had to admit that there is little chance of nominating a conservative because the labor unions have "bought" the Democratic party in the North.

● Behind the facade of GOP confidence — built up by the White House Palace Guard — there are grave worries. These center on the rebelliousness of the anti-New Dealers in the GOP. When the group of Western independents — Lee of Utah, McCarthy, Dirksen, etc. — in the Party held their rally last Lincoln's Birthday in Chicago, the Palace Guard people were alarmed and soon after shifted the locale of the '56 convention from the Middle West to San Francisco. They are still nervous.

It is known that they have sent investigators out on the road to survey "grass roots sentiment" — the mission is to find out if the anti-New Deal Republicans would support Ike in '56.

● Many Democratic politicians last weekend privately said that Ike's popularity should enable him to win over Stevenson (if the latter chooses to run) in 1956. But cautious observers recalled that most Democratic politicos in 1948 privately said that Dewey, GOP candidate in that year, was invincible and that Truman could not win.

● The day after the Democratic visitors departed, Representative Gavin (R., Pa.) assailed Administration plans for Foreign Aid, on the floor of the House; and he was joined in this refrain by Representative Gross (R., Ia.)

● Characteristic of the extraordinary political situation in the Administration is a story circulating in GOP circles. The President recently received GOP women political leaders. One of the ladies asked Ike: "Why don't you make public your candidacy for re-election now, Mr. President, and that way make certain victory in 1956?" The President, with a deprecating gesture asked: "Why don't you ladies talk about a younger man for 1956 — say Bob Anderson of Texas?" As one of the ladies later remarked: "You could hear a pin drop." For Anderson (now Assistant to Secretary of Defense Wilson) is a Democrat.

● In the last 48 hours there has been much talk among the press boys about the nervousness of certain metropolitan newspaper publishers. Those papers last summer — during the "lynch McCarthy period" — ran stories to the effect that McCarthy was in trouble with the Internal Revenue Bureau and had failed to pay $25,000 in taxes. Now the Bureau vindicates the Wisconsin Senator by giving him a refund of over $1,000. It is recalled that McCarthy a year ago won a libel suit against a newspaper for a considerable sum of money. Meanwhile, on Capitol Hill, there is some talk about the necessity of a re-examination of censure of the Wisconsin Senator, in view of the Internal Revenue Bureau action.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China Story: Diplomatic row engages in speculation about the sudden trip of Admiral Radford and Assistant Secretary of State Robertson to Formosa, as follows: they have been sent by the President to urge Chiang Kai-shek to abandon Quemoy and Matsu; since Radford and Robertson have been good friends of the Generalissimo, the White House hopes they can exert persuasive powers. So the speculation runs. But what if Chiang refuses and replies that he intends to fight to the last man on those islands? And suppose the Reds attack and Chiang resists on Quemoy and Matsu? Then, diplomatic observers agree, the uproar abroad and in the United States will be considerable — with quite unpredictable consequences.

Labor Front: On the heels of the Republican defeat in the spring elections for state offices in Michigan, there comes a wave of reaction in various parts of the country. Spending running to perhaps over a million dollars by labor unions is said to have contributed to the Democratic victory in Michigan.

One measure to remedy this evil was advanced in Wisconsin in the past week. There, a bill was introduced into the State Legislature to prohibit labor organizations from contributing to political campaigns. The Republican Speaker of the Lower House, Mark Catlin, reminded the body that just fifty years ago Governor Robert M. La Follette (later Senator) put through a law banning industrial organizations from contributing to political funds. Observers remarked that the "wheel has come full circle in a half a century." For in 1905, the trusts and big business were the target of political discontent; now the labor bosses have succeeded the tycoons of business in public disfavor.

The Wisconsin Legislative body, controlled by Republicans, gave preliminary approval on April 13 to the measure to harness labor's political activity by a vote of 59 to 40 and voted down, by 61 to 38, a Democratic motion to kill the bill.

Leaders of national labor organizations in Washington show great concern over the development.

Milton Eisenhower: Milton Eisenhower has been reported as believing in world government and of exerting his tremendous influence on the President to promote such a system. Attention, therefore, is being given to a pamphlet by James L. Henderson entitled "UNESCO In Focus", with a foreword by Milton Eisenhower.

Dr. Eisenhower says in his foreword: "I have personally been enormously stimulated by the picture he [Henderson] paints in swift, colorful strokes of an international effort with which I've been intimately involved and to which I am profoundly committed. I sincerely hope many will read and think about this pamphlet."

In his pamphlet Henderson writes: "Specifically, educators and teachers, for example, have a great role to play in helping to build up the outlooks and attitudes which would favor the establishment of World Government. By cooperating with UNESCO they will, through coordination of effort, increase their strength and effectiveness."

How We Lost The Peace: The great "revision" of the propaganda version of the last war and the peace treaties — all of which lead us into the present dangerous international "mess" — is now well under way. Freda Utley in her article in HUMAN EVENTS last week, entitled "Yalta Then and Now" underlined the real reason for the sell-out of Roosevelt and Churchill in 1945: "Few have pointed out that the clue to Yalta is to be found in our abandonment of both Christian principles and common sense when we demanded 'unconditional surrender.' Yet there can be no doubt that had it not been for this cruel and stupid 'war aim', formulated by Roosevelt at Casablanca (1943) and accepted by Churchill with some reluctance, Stalin would have been unable to blackmail us at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam."

From the standpoint of common sense, no one — among diplomats and military men — has ever fathomed the rationale of the "unconditional surrender" formula. Stalin did not practice it himself: he made a distinction between the German people and the "Hitlerites," and often hinted that he might make another deal with the Germans. But the formula prevented the West from doing likewise, from cooperating with elements in Germany anxious to overthrow Hitler and make peace. Such cooperation was the alternative to our sell-out policy at Yalta and Teheran, and had it not been for "unconditional

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surrender" our leaders could have used this policy to counter Stalin's blackmail at Teheran and Yalta. Thus we could have won the peace. This illuminating view of history — held by well-informed observers here — effectively answers the argument of Lippmann and other apologists for Roosevelt — that we had no other alternative, that we had to bow to Russian *force majeure.*

Cognizant of this view of Yalta, we may report, leaders in the Congress are now probing the history of our attitude towards and policy on Germany, the origins of the Morgenthau Plan and attempts to enforce it under our occupation.

The biggest blunder of the last war — as insiders see it — was the failure to recognize the value of and cooperate with the German Underground against Hitler. The American public knew virtually nothing about this well-kept secret of World War II until after the war.

HUMAN EVENTS was the first to break the story of the German Underground in two articles, entitled "The Epic of the German Underground" (February 27, 1946) by Alexander B. Maley, a U.S. Naval Intelligence officer and "Resistance in the German Foreign Office" (April 3, 1946) by E. A. Bayne, a U.S. Economic Intelligence officer. Over a year later, in April 1947, Allen W. Dulles (now head of Central Intelligence Agency) confirmed most of the facts revealed in HUMAN EVENTS about the German movement in a book *Germany's Underground,* published in that month by Macmillan. Dulles had been an OSS agent in Switzerland from 1942-45 and during those years was in close touch with the Underground. He revealed that he had kept the White House and higher echelons in Washington fully informed of the situation, but that nothing was done to encourage cooperation.

Congressional investigators now at work will seek to find out the truth of a story which went the rounds in war-time Washington, that some official in the Roosevelt Administration betrayed German Underground leaders to the Gestapo, thereby causing their execution and the break-up of Underground activities against Hitler.

Members of Congress would like to know definitely why several years of war and hundreds of thousands of American casualties were lost by failure to take advantage of this "secret weapon against Hitler." Diplomats would like to know why we failed to utilize this weapon to stop Stalin's blackmail at Teheran and Yalta and to ensure an enduring and peaceful settlement of both Europe and the Far East.

Government in Business: Since World War II Congress has endeavored to establish a strong merchant marine which would serve our commerce and also be ready to assist the military in the event of war. Despite substantial subsidies our merchant marine is declining and is barely holding on. Other nations, however, have steadily expanded their commercial fleet.

The Hoover Commission reveals the astonishing fact that the troubles of our merchant marine are due chiefly to ruinous competition from the Military Sea Transport Service (MSTS) of the Defense Department — a situation that borders on the fantastic.

When MSTS was created in 1949 it was solemnly agreed by the Pentagon that MSTS "should perform no service which private industry can perform" — a hollow agreement in the light of what has happened.

Today MSTS operates a fleet of more than 200 ships which are in direct competition with U.S. commercial ships. In 1954 its ships moved some fifteen million tons of cargo into and out of the United States. The "imbalance" of this traffic is startling. For every six tons outbound only one ton was inbound, showing that homeward bound ships of the MSTS had relatively empty cargo holds. The Commission found that more than eighty-five percent of the large cargo traffic of MSTS could be carried in commercial ships of lines which have annually offered abundant space without success.

The passenger fleet of MSTS in 1954 consisted of 60 ships compared to only 40 for the whole merchant marine. The Commission reported that the number of civilians travelling on the ships of the Military Sea Transport Service in 1954 was *almost half* the number of commercial travellers carried by all privately owned U.S. flag ships combined.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Korean war private tankers were requisitioned and their American owners (unlike the owners of tankers in allied countries) lost some thirty five million dollars as a result of foregoing more profitable trade. Today the industry has around 50 of its tankers laid up for want of business while MSTS tankers in 1954 transported 11,900,000 tons of petroleum compared with only 4,300,000 tons by private tankers. Thus the owners of U.S. private tankers have watched their industry practically taken over by the Defense Department.

One conclusion is drawn here by economy-minded legislators:

Forcing MSTS to turn over most of its passenger and cargo traffic to the merchant marine would bring to an end the wasteful efforts of bureaucracy to maintain two merchant marines (one civilian and one military), affect savings for the taxpayers on subsidies to private carriers and produce more taxable income for the Federal government in the U.S. merchant marine.

Education Front: Those in Congress opposed to Federal aid to education suspect that the Federal Office of Education harbors a clique of educators desirous of such aid and that the clique has become so enthusiastic as to make public false statistics to justify their demands for Federal assistance to the states. Members are still discussing the amazing revelation (see HUMAN EVENTS, April 9) that Mrs. Hobby had erred in a public statement: namely, when she said that Federal aid to states was necessary because some 400,000 classrooms (by 1960) were needed. When challenged, Mrs. Hobby had to withdraw this figure and reduce it to only 176,000 classrooms needed.

No one in Washington believes that Mrs. Hobby or Dr. Brownell (head of the Office of Education) falsified the figures. They had to depend on the bureaucrats in their offices. Who are the members of the clique? — is a question asked on Capitol Hill.

Meanwhile, there has arisen strong reaction to another blooper by Mrs. Hobby (or rather, her "statisticians.") The first Hobby statement said that Indiana suffered from outstanding "overcrowding of schools" among schools of the Nation, and credited it with "more than 365,000 children in overcrowded classrooms." Indianans familiar with their state's educational situation found this claim absurd. No such situation, they said, exists or ever did exist. As one Indianan remarked, "It is true there are a few crowded schools in a very few districts, produced by sudden shifts in population, being met by large-scale new construction. There are also at least as many schools with enrollments of only one-half to two-thirds of their normal capacities, generally for the same reasons in reverse."

The Indianapolis *Times* (Scripps Howard) challenged the Hobby figures and asked the Office of Education for the source of the information. The newspaper was given a copy of the report authorized by Congress in 1951, but there were no such figures in it. Next the *Times* was referred to the Indiana State Department of Education, but that body had no such figures, nor knew of any.

The crusading *Times* editorially concluded: "The fact is, there just is no basis for these 'statistics' on Indiana. Yet they are offered to Congress as incontrovertible reasons why the Federal government must provide 'aid' to local schools. What basis is there, then, if any, for the rest of the 'figures,' on the dire condition in other states, similarly being used? Who is misleading a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States into such costly and no doubt embarrassing inaccuracy? Who provided the phony statistics on which the whole case for Federal aid seems to be built?"

Letter from THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY: "I have been a subscriber to HUMAN EVENTS from the outset of its publication and I look forward each week to receiving my copy. In other words, it is 'must reading' for me as soon as it reaches my desk."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 17 HUMAN EVENTS April 23, 1955

Article Section

THREE HIGH SCHOOL DEBATES

By FRANK CHODOROV

THIS FALL, as usual, high school debating teams throughout the country will engage in forensic contests. The propositions to be debated are based on a "problem": *How should educational opportunities be increased for the youth of the United States?*

The arguments which follow below, after each debate proposition, are intended to help the negative side, and HUMAN EVENTS hopes that its readers will bring them to the attention of high school students who will participate in the debate. But first, to satisfy the curiosity of readers who are not familiar with the proceedings, here is how the "problem" is selected, and the debate propositions initiated.

The National University Extension Association, "with power to act in the interest of the high school leagues throughout the United States" entrusts the matter to its Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials. This Committee, we quote from its printed announcement, acts "as a clearing house . . . with no authority of its own but consults the wishes of autonomous leagues in each of the states, and offers its services to all the leagues." Each year "The Committee provides the machinery by which the several state leagues may agree upon a common problem for the national high school discussion and debate series." A conference of delegates is held every December. "This conference selects three problems which are submitted to a referendum of state high school leagues. The problem approved by the state high school leagues is usually announced by the Committee as the national high school forensic problem of the year."

Thus, the whole thing is well organized and quite in the democratic formula. If an ideological bias appears in the wording of the "problem," or of the debate propositions, it follows that all who participated in the selection were of the same bias. Only the names of organizations appear in the picture; no individuals.

THE DEBATE PROPOSITIONS.

RESOLVED, THAT Government subsidies should be granted according to need to high school students who qualify for additional training.

1. Since the government has no means of its own, what this proposition really means is that the taxpayers of the country should be compelled to finance the higher education of the beneficiary students. Why? On what moral ground can we justify the use of force in this manner? If we assume that the government has some inherent right to the earnings of its citizens, and may use what it collects as it sees fit, without regard for the wishes of the taxpayers, then we are conceding that the individual has no right to his

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

property. Even if 51 percent of the taxpayers should vote to subsidize a special group, the right of the other 49 percent to the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor cannot, in justice, be denied.

2. A subsidy is a grant of taxpayers' money. By what right can the students lay claim to the property of others? Why should the boy or girl who has reached the age of eighteen, or thereabouts, be singled out for special subvention just because he or she has reached that age?

3. "According to need" means that the government will set up the machinery for determining the economic status of applicants for higher education. Obviously, the student must prove that his family is unable to pay the costs, or all of them. The student must declare his poverty. If the government wishes, it may check on his statement by making inquiries of neighbors, at the bank, or by interrogating the members of his family.

The government acquires that inquisitorial right by virtue of the subsidy it grants; besides, as custodian of the taxpayers' money it is duty bound to see that the "need" is established before it grants the subsidy. But, in the administration of this clause in the proposition — "according to need" — it is in fact classifying people according to income groups. The boys and girls who qualify will then be known as the "poor," and perhaps the label will stick to them throughout their college years. The subsidy will set up a class system legally.

4. Then there is a definition of "need" needed. Does it mean tuition fees only? The tuition fees charged by most of our state colleges are so low that only those in the lowest income brackets find it difficult to pay them; and it is likely that families in those brackets would be more concerned with what the high school graduate could add to the family income than with his further education. In that case, his "need" is food, shelter, raiment. Will the subsidy take care of that as well as his tuition fees, and will it include something for the family that has lost his contribution to its income? The word "need" is as variable as the phrase "standard of living," and is just as subjective. Yet a subsidy is not subjective; it is a definite sum of money. How much?

5. "Who qualify for additional training." This implies the setting up of standards for college entrance. Who will set them, and how? Some colleges now accept the high school diploma as sufficient evidence of proficiency, regardless of the educational standards of the high school; others require candidates for admission to pass entrance examinations. Will the subsidizing government require the latter colleges to lower their entrance requirements to the standards it sets?

It is possible that the committee of standards will be composed of, or influenced by, politicians; this is particularly true in those states where the colleges are in fact part of the government machinery. Is it not likely, therefore, that qualification for entrance will be determined, at least in part, by political considerations — by the political influence of his father?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESOLVED, THAT the educational privileges granted to veterans of the Korean war be accorded to all qualified youth.

(Some of the above arguments apply to the second and third debate propositions.)

1. The educational privileges granted to veterans of the Korean War stem from the act known as the "G.I. Bill of Rights," passed after the Second World War. The argument for that act was that since the government deprived the draftee of his chance at an education, it was incumbent on the government to make redress, to give back to the boy that which he was compelled by the national emergency to give up.

There is a sort of *quid pro quo* in the law; this is passed over in the proposal, and the law is used merely as an excuse to ask "something for nothing" for every high school graduate. He may not be drafted, his education may not be interrupted, and yet he is to be given privileges specifically designed as compensation for those who actually served in the armed forces. On what principle?

2. In point of fact, the proposal is simply another way of saying that the nation's taxpayers should provide every boy and girl with a college education. And the assumption is that this should be an obligation of the Federal government. If the proposal became law, the government would assume the function of educating everybody at the college level, even though at present it has no jurisdiction over education in the lower and high school grades; this is still and always has been a local matter.

Since college education is dependent upon previous training, it follows that the government would find itself obligated to take over the preparatory schooling, and thus the proposal amounts to the nationalizing of all schooling — from kindergarten to where? Perhaps the graduate professional schools. So, the proposal to give every boy and girl the educational privileges accorded to veterans involves the much larger question, is the nationalization of all education desirable?

3. It is true that the proposal limits the special privilege to "qualified American youth." But, how can a government, deriving its power from the people governed, presume to separate the morons from the geniuses? Both have, or soon will have, the privilege of voting. The best the government can do under the circumstances is to adjust entrance requirements as well as the standards of college education to the lowest common denominator of intellectual capacity. In that case, of what value will a college education be? The superior minds will find it a bore, and their only chance for developing the capacities with which nature endowed them will be in private colleges which have not succumbed to subsidies.

RESOLVED, THAT the federal government should grant higher education to qualified high school graduates through grants to universities and colleges.

1. This proposal reflects a fear of political interference in the management of education. What it says, in effect, is that the government should hand over to the college administration a sum of money to be used for this special project, and should accept the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

administration's word for it that the project has been carried out, without supervision or investigation. Should Congress, which is custodian of the taxpayers' money, make an appropriation of that kind?

2. And what happens to "academic freedom" when the subsidizer threatens to withdraw his subvention if his wishes are not complied with? Let us suppose that, in response to popular clamor, the government frowns on the teaching of some subject or theory — like the theory of evolution. Will the faculty, faced with the loss of needed income, retain the subject in its curriculum? Suppose some economics professor should assert in class that deficit financing is detrimental to the economy of the nation, or that inflation is a form of counterfeiting — practices to which the government is committed; and let us also suppose that his teachings gain favor and reach the ears of government. What will happen to him? You cannot get away from the fact that he who pays the fiddler calls the tune.

THE PATTERN OF THOUGHT in which the debate proposals are framed is easy to perceive. It is, first of all, egalitarian. The unstated assumption in the "problem" is that all the youth of the country are equally susceptible of learning and that only the "opportunities" need be increased to produce a nation in which intellectual achievement will be spread out evenly, like butter on bread. Only in the stipulation "who qualify" is there a suggestion that some high school graduates may be intellectually superior to others; but this stipulation seems to be an unimportant concession in view of the egalitarianism implied in the proposals. When it is proposed to make higher education easier to obtain, the assumption is that the number of those who are capable of absorbing higher education is practically indefinite.

This is the old notion that all men are equally capable of perfection and that education is the means for achieving it. But, it is a fact of experience that differences in native capacity do exist, and that when these differences are not taken into account the result must be a lowering of the standards of education; if all are to be educated it is necessary to bring the standards down to the level of all. The egalitarian, of course, does not admit of differences in mental capacity.

The second assumption of this pattern of thought is that it is the duty of government to provide educational opportunities. This is in line with the paternalistic concept of government. The concept is woven into the wording of the propositions, so that the teenage debater absorbs it unconsciously, whether he is on the affirmative or negative side. The seed of socialism is implanted in the mind at a most fertile stage, so that when maturity arrives it is difficult for reason to root it out.

This is not brainwashing; it is brain-twisting. And it is all too obviously done with malice aforethought. By whom?

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED